Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.  Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 written findings of noncompliance for this indicator. The State also reported that four EIS programs had initiated services, although late, for six children who had not received timely services in FFY 2006.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) was corrected.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.  The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).  If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 71.0%. These data	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the justification for services not provided in the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
home or programs for typically developing children.	represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 78.35%.  The State did not meet its target of 76.5%.			natural environment provision requirements in 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1)(ii) was timely	
[Results Indicator]					corrected.  OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
3. Percent of infants and toddlers	The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data	for this in	dicator are	:	The State reported the required progress
with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:  A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);  B. Acquisition and use of	07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication);	a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	0	0	0.34	
and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	14.09	12.03	7.56	
	c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	18.56	27.84	20.27	
	d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	38.83	43.64	42.61	
	e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to sameaged peers.	28.52	16.49	29.21	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00	100.00	99.99%	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early	The State's reported data for this indicator are:					OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
intervention services have helped the family:  A. Know their rights;  B. Effectively communicate their		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	
children's needs; and	A. Know their rights. (%)	76	78	76	2.00%	
C. Help their children develop and learn.  [Results Indicator]	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	73	74	73	1.00%	
	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	83	82	80	-1.00%	
	These data represent progress for Indicators 4A and 4B and slippage for Indicator 4C.  The State met all of its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.					
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.64%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 0.72%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0.82%.			OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in		
A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and				performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.		
B. National data.						
[Results Indicator]						
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.92%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.84%.			ese data	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improvement performance.	
A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and	The State met its FFY 2007 target of 1.86%.					
B. National data.						
[Results Indicator]						
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.5%. The data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 98%.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.  Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance for this indicator because the noncompliance reported in FFY 2006 was due to data reporting and collection errors and not to late initial IFSP meetings.	2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.
		The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.  If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
8. Percent of all children exiting	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.7%. These data	The State reported that noncompliance
Part C who received timely transition planning to support the	represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	identified in FFY 2006 with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR
child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community	The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY	§§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) was corrected in a timely manner.
services by their third birthday including:	2006 were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;		2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in
[Compliance Indicator]		compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4)

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		and 303.344(h), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.
		The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.  If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to
		ensure compliance.
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:  B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 98%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.  OSEP's December 2008 memo provided its review of the State's opt-out policy and required the State to submit its revised policy by June 30, 2009. The State's revised policy, submitted to OSEP on March 31, 2009, addressed the issues raised in OSEP's December 2008 memo.  Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State did not report that it made FFY 2006 written findings of noncompliance for this indicator. The State reported that two EIS programs had notified the LEA for two children for whom the LEA had not been notified in FFY 2006.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR \$303.148(b)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the LEA notification requirement in 34 CFR \$303.148(b)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.
		The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s); and (2) has provided notification to the LEA, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.
		If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92%.  The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.  Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State did not report that it made FFY 2006 written findings of noncompliance for this indicator. The State reported that two EIS programs had corrected instances of noncompliance from FFY 2006.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely transition requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) was corrected in a timely manner.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely transition requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)).
9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 89%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.  The State reported that five of six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner, and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by December 2008.	The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501(b), and OSEP Memo 09-02.
		In reporting on correction of

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.
		In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A and 8B in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
		In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.
10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one complaint. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.  The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §§303.510 through 303.512.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the FFY 2007 reporting period. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution	Not applicable.	This indicator does not apply to the State because the State has not adopted the Part B due process procedures to resolve Part C

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).		due process hearing requests.
[Results Indicator]		
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.  [Results Indicator]	The State reported that it did not receive any requests for mediations during the FFY 2007 reporting period. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data.  The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations are held.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.  The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.  In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.